

## REMARKS

### Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-25 are considered in the Office action.

The Office action has specified the proper format for an abstract.

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as non-enabled.

Claims 1-8 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-19 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Tyler et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,638,498 ("Tyler").

Claims 24 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tyler.

Claims 5 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tyler in view of Charpentier U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/00162333 ("Charpentier").

Claims 20 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tyler in view of Even U.S. Patent No. 5,680,622 ("Even").

### Summary of the Reply

Applicants have amended the abstract to comply with the requirements for an abstract. Applicants also have amended claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-16 and 18 to correct typographical errors and more particularly describe and distinctly claim the invention. Applicants also have cancelled claims 17 and 19-25 without prejudice.

### Reply to § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as non-enabled, and claims 1-8 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In particular, the Office action states that the phrase "binary RDO file" is not clearly defined in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand from reading the entire specification that "RDO" means "Raster Document Object," a proprietary file format by

Xerox Corporation. The Office action also states that other claim language is undefined or unclear. Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-16 and 18 to correct typographical errors and more particularly describe and distinctly claim the invention, and have cancelled claims 17 and 19-25 without prejudice. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the § 112 rejections be withdrawn.

#### Reply to § 102 and 103 Rejections


The claimed invention describes methods and apparatus for converting a first file in a binary RDO format to a second file in a second format, the first file comprising references to one or more page image files and data that includes instructions for assembling the page image files into one or more document pages, the second file comprising one or more output pages, each output page associated with a corresponding document page, the methods and apparatus reading the first file, decoding the RDO format of the first file to identify the data, sorting the identified data on a document page basis, and placing the page image files for each document page on the associated output page according to the assembly instructions in the sorted data.

Unlike the claimed invention, however, none of the cited references pertain to methods and apparatus for converting RDO format files, as such files are described in this application. Because the cited reference do not describe or suggest the claimed invention, applicants respectfully request that the rejections of amended independent claims 1 and 9 be withdrawn. Because all other claims depend from claims 1 and 9, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-16 and 18 be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, applicants submit that this application, including claims 1-16 and 18, is allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner allow this application.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James Trosino  
Registration No. 39,862  
Attorney for Applicants